

ALTSHULER BERZON LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

JAMES BALTZER
KATHERINE G. BASS
HAMILTON CANDEE
MAX CARTER-OBERSTONE
EVE H. CERVANTEZ
CONNIE CHAN
BARBARA J. CHISHOLM
LISA DEMIDOVICH
JAMES M. FINBERG
EILEEN B. GOLDSMITH
CORINNE JOHNSON
SCOTT A. KRONLAND
JONAH J. LALAS
JUNYUNG HAROLD LEE
DANIELLE E. LEONARD
STACEY M. LEYTON
AMANDA C. LYNCH
DERIN MCLEOD
MATTHEW J. MURRAY
BRONWEN B. O'HERIN
ZOE PALITZ
JONATHAN ROSENTHAL
MICHAEL RUBIN
TALIA STENDER
ROBIN S. THOLIN
EMANUEL A. WADDELL
ALICE X. WANG

177 POST ST. SUITE 300
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108
(415) 421-7151

350 W. COLORADO BLVD. SUITE 420
PASADENA, CA 91105
(323) 963-8693

FAX (415) 362-8064

WWW.ALTSHULERBERZON.COM

FRED H. ALTSHULER (1943-2024)
FOUNDING PARTNER

STEPHEN P. BERZON
FOUNDING PARTNER
PARTNER EMERITUS
SPECIAL COUNSEL

PETER D. NUSSBAUM
JEFFREY B. DEMAIN
DANIEL T. PURTELL
PARTNERS EMERITUS

ALEXANDER PECHT
FELLOW

September 22, 2025

VIA ACMS

Molly C. Dwyer, Clerk of Court
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
James R. Browning United States Courthouse
95 7th Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: *In re Trump*, No. 25-4476

Dear Ms. Dwyer:

Real Parties in Interest-Plaintiffs (“Plaintiffs”) hereby respond to the correspondence filed by Petitioners-Defendants (“Defendants”) earlier today (Dkt. 26.1).

This Court administratively stayed the District Court’s July 18, 2025 order pending disposition of Defendants’ petition for writ of mandamus. That mandamus petition has now been denied. As such, the stay is no longer in effect, and Defendants should have sought their requested relief by filing a motion to enter a new administrative stay rather than through correspondence.

In any event, Plaintiffs oppose Defendants’ request that this Court take the highly unusual step of granting a further administrative stay of a District Court order for which mandamus was denied. Disposition of an en banc petition may take weeks and is unlikely to change the result of this petition. For reasons explained in further detail in Plaintiffs’ Answer to Petition for Writ of Mandamus and Opposition to Motion for Stay (Dkt. 10.1), Defendants have failed to show that

In re Trump, No. 25-4476

Page 2 of 2

any prejudice would result from their production of the ARRP's as ordered by the District Court. By contrast, further delay in obtaining those documents (which have already been delayed by two months) will severely hinder Plaintiffs' ability to litigate, and the District Court's ability to adjudicate, the dispute that the Supreme Court contemplated would be addressed following its stay order. For these reasons, Plaintiffs oppose any further stay.

Sincerely,

/s/ Stacey M. Leyton

Stacey M. Leyton

cc: All counsel of record (via ACMS)